



**Agenda Item #:** 2

**Project Title:** 5433 Wayne Terrace - Comprehensive Design Review (CDR) of Signage

**Legistar File ID #:** 80807

**Members Present:** Cliff Goodhart, Chair; Wendy von Below, Shane Bernau, Jessica Klehr, Christian Harper, Marsha Rummel, and Rafeeq Asad

**Prepared By:** Jessica Vaughn, AICP, UDC Secretary

## Summary

At its meeting of December 13, 2023, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a Comprehensive Design Review located at 5433 Wayne Terrace. Registered and speaking in support were Jim Triatik, Grant Oster, and Stephen Franklin.

Matt Tucker, Building Inspection Director, gave an overview of the CDR for a reimagining of Zimbrick Hyundai. The area of staff concern relates to the existing pylon sign being refaced and the request to add a second ground sign, which exceeds the ground sign square-footage allowance, primarily because the existing sign is over the allowed size. Exception requests don't necessarily get grandfathered in when you request a second larger sign. The applicant should consider alternatives to the existing or proposed sign, such as a one-side monument sign versus the two-sided sign proposed. There are other alternatives and options beyond re-facing the sign and asking for an exception for another sign. That is a more consistent approach in satisfying the Comprehensive Design Review for signage.

Franklin presented the proposed pylon reface, noting that the owner does not want to reduce the size of the sign; this is an option presented to reimage it. The five-foot monument sign is requested for the dealer to have next to the car pad, and will be close to their entrance off of Wayne Terrace. The square footage is over, but there is a neighboring property with a Kia dealership that also has an 18-foot monument sign. It seems some leeway has been given in the past to some of these sites. In the scope of creating visual harmony, the Kia neighbor was able to get approval through the Zoning counter with a monument sign that stands near this signage. To have one sign dwarfing the other, while not asking for 18 feet, 16 feet and a ground sign would create harmony at this intersection.

The Commission had the following questions for staff and the development team:

- This is a question more for staff and maybe the applicant team; regarding this monument sign, you see the big pylon sign at the corner. It is not until "View E" where you would see the monument sign at the driveway. If you're coming from High Crossing, it's pretty intuitive what your destination is. But coming from Wayne Terrace, I don't know if it's visible from that direction. Could you explain that rationale?
- (Secretary) The general thought is that the primary entrance to the site is from High Crossing, so people are really accessing from High Crossing, coming from either the north or south and the first thing you see is the prominence of the pole sign as it exists today, and the site sits significantly higher on the site than the street so the wall signage would also guide folks to the correct places as a result. In general, the staff consensus was that the collection of monument signs as proposed in the CDR request was in excess of what would be allowed by the code; staff was not supportive of that. There are other ways to get there than what we're seeing on the screen. Instead of refacing the pole sign and keeping the proposed ground sign, but to ultimately somehow bring signage closer to being in compliance with the code.

- (M. Tucker) Parking lot directionals are also an option that the code allows. The building really is proud of the street, it is one of these buildings that is nicely forward. You can see the building and it's very obvious that the dealer is there.
- Is there enough square footage to add a "Zimbrick" on the band next to where it says "service?" They're getting to guide people in the service bays.
- (M. Tucker) There's room, but my understanding is there are some brand requirements that require things to be signed separately, and they don't want to over-sign things. But that is an option if they are not satisfied with not having a second ground sign.
- Any response to the claim that Kia is getting away with something that isn't being allowed at Hyundai here?
- (M. Tucker) It's a statement of fairness and fairness is not a standard in CDRs. We went through that specific property, the allowances for that specific development and it's not on the table for discussion so a question about fairness between them is not really appropriate as part of this request. It's more about how this property is best signed. Going down the path of fairness is not a good path to go down. But I will recognize the point of symmetry. High Crossing is such a mish mash of dealers and different sign types and designs; there are so many ways you can get there. That could be something, I don't know. It's more of something on the same zoning lot but not so much when you're dealing with all the different curveballs of these dealers meeting their national brand standards in addition to the City of Madison requirements. We were not against the original design but having been down that path on the beltline on the westside, where the commission approved a much smaller sign. That is how we are getting to this sign tonight.

The Commission discussed the following:

- I noticed after having read the report and looking at a broader site map, you have to be on High Crossing to get to Wayne Terrace. By the time you get to where "E" is, if you don't know this is the Hyundai dealership for service, there will be that 16-foot sign right there that is being refaced. The worst-case scenario is that you pass it and then have to loop around. I think because Wayne Terrace feeds off of High Crossing, it really looks intuitive to find the dealership, particularly on a prominent corner without needing the additional monument sign.
- What I heard from staff was that there seem to be ways to meet the code and still help them get the required branding and wayfinding. I'm inclined to want to see what that might look like.
- I'm not understanding how the two signs don't have the same design characteristics in terms of size and shape. To me they do look similar and I am wondering what I am missing.
- They're referring to the pylon sign and the monument sign. One is horizontally oriented on a big skinny pole, and the monument sign of course is a monument.
- On the face of it, this doesn't seem like it's anything grossly oversized or ostentatious. Consistency is important with these things. We frequently hear that everybody wants to show you something else that is the same thing and why aren't we allowed to do this too. We're arguing and defending those ordinances as it is. We bend quite a bit, people act like we don't but practically every meeting we have signage before us where staff says they're fine with a variance or exception. They're solid in their reasoning, my inherent line of thought on most of these is to go along with the staff report, particularly where it was pointed out they were given a pass earlier on the oversized pylon sign, to ask for more on top of that seems pushing it a little too far. My recommendation of allowing the re-facing and the directional sign in the parking lot but not the monument sign as proposed is something I feel pretty comfortable sticking with.

## Action

On a motion by von Below, seconded by Klehr, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of the CDR request, with the following conditions:

- The proposed monument sign shall not be included as part of the signage package.

- The applicant shall explore alternatives such as directional signage to enter that parking area. Directional signage shall be reviewed by staff unless staff determines it to require UDC review and that the directional signage shall comply with Chapter 31.

The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (6-0).